

AUS920010333US1

REMARKSAllowable Subject Matter

The Office Action advises that claims 8, 12, 13, 22, 26, 27, 36, 40, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and further rewritten to overcome the objections to claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively. The Office Action further advises that the reason for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 8, 22, and 36 is "the travel server validating travel described in travel records against admission rules stored in admission rules databases ..." The Office Action further advises that the reason for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 is "reporting to the traveler through an internet-enabled device a result of the comparison ..."

In response, Applicants have amended the claims in the present application as set forth above in this Response by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 the elements corresponding to the reason for allowable subject matter from claims 8, 22, and 36. Making claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 dependent from claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively, as is done by the above amendments, eliminates any need to rewrite them separately as independent claims – because they now depend from allowable independent claims. Applicants respectfully propose that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance in accordance with the advice of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 14 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandyk ("No Entry") in view of official notice. Claims 15-21, 23-25, 28-35, 37-39, and 42 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandyk ("No Entry") in view of official notice and Crandall, *et al.* (Publication No. US 2002/0109647 A1). In response, Applicants have amended the

AUS920010333US1

claims in the present application as noted above by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 the elements corresponding to the reason for allowable subject matter from claims 8, 22, and 36 – thereby rendering independent claims 1, 15, and 39 allowable. Applicants respectfully propose that the independent claims are allowable, and all the claims depending from the independent claims therefore are now allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 1-42 stand rejected for obviousness or objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. In response, Applicants have amended the claims in the present application as set forth above in this Response by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 from claims 8, 22, and 36 elements corresponding to reasons for allowable subject matter – thereby rendering the independent claims allowable – and therefore also rendering all claims depending from them allowable also. The rejections of and objections to claims 1-42 should therefore be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-42 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2004

By: 

John Biggers
Reg. No. 44,537
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
504 Lavaca Street, Suite 970
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS